

SEMINOLE COUNTY GOVERNMENT AGENDA MEMORANDUM

SUBJECT: Professional Services: PS-1905-07/BLH - Engineering Study, Inventory and Design for the Monroe Drainage Basin

DEPARTMENT: Administrative Services

DIVISION: Purchasing and Contracts

AUTHORIZED BY: Steve Howard

CONTACT: Lisa Riner

EXT: 7113

MOTION/RECOMMENDATION:

Approve ranking list and authorize rate negotiations for PS-1905-07/BLH - Engineering Study, Inventory and Design for the Monroe Drainage Basin with CDM of Maitland, Florida.

County-wide

Ray Hooper

BACKGROUND:

PS-1905-07/BLH will provide for an update of the existing basin study and inventories, as well as design corrections, for known stormwater deficiencies within the Monroe Drainage Basin. Services to be performed will include, but are not limited to, evaluating, prioritizing and designing corrections for deficiencies within the basin.

This project was publicly advertised and the County received five (5) submittals (listed alphabetically):

Boyle Engineering Corporation
CDM
Environmental Consulting & Technology, Inc.
HDR Engineering, Inc.
MACTEC Engineering and Consulting, Inc.

The Evaluation Committee, which consisted of Jerry McCollum, County Engineer, Public Works Engineering; Mark Flomerfelt, Stormwater Manager, Roads-Stormwater; Kimberly Ornberg, Principal Engineer, Roads-Stormwater; Bob Walter, Senior Engineer, Public Works Engineering; and Roland Raymundo, Principal Engineer, Roads-Stormwater, evaluated the submittals. Consideration was given to approach/understanding of the project, qualifications of proposed personnel and the firm, similar project experience, and location of the firm. The Committee agreed to interview the following three (3) firms (listed alphabetically):

CDM
Environmental Consulting & Technology, Inc.
MACTEC Engineering and Consulting, Inc.

The Committee interviewed the three (3) short-listed firms giving consideration to project approach and understanding of the project, similar work of proposed team, and innovative and cost-saving ideas. The backup documentation includes the Tabulation Sheet, the Evaluation Consensus Sheet, and the Presentation Consensus and Score Sheets. The Committee

recommends that the Board approve the ranking below and authorize staff to negotiate with the top-ranked firm, CDM, in accordance with F.S. 287.055, the Consultants Competitive Negotiation Act (CCNA).

1. CDM
2. Environmental Consulting and Technology, Inc.
3. MACTEC Engineering and Consulting, Inc.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends the Board approve the ranking list and authorize rate negotiations for PS-1905-07/BLH - Engineering Study, Inventory and Design for the Monroe Drainage Basin with CDM of Maitland, Florida.

ATTACHMENTS:

1. PS-1905-07 Agenda Backup

Additionally Reviewed By:

☒ County Attorney Review (Ann Colby)

**B.C.C. - SEMINOLE COUNTY, FL
PS TABULATION SHEET**

PS NUMBER: PS-1905-07/BLH
PS TITLE : Engineering Study, Inventory and Design for the Monroe Drainage Basin
DATE: April 18, 2007 TIME: 2:00 P.M.

ALL SUBMITTALS ACCEPTED BY SEMINOLE COUNTY ARE SUBJECT TO THE COUNTY'S TERMS AND CONDITIONS AND ANY AND ALL ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS SUBMITTED BY THE PROPOSERS ARE REJECTED AND SHALL HAVE NO FORCE AND EFFECT. PS DOCUMENTS FROM THE PROPOSERS LISTED HEREIN ARE THE ONLY SUBMITTALS RECEIVED TIMELY AS OF THE ABOVE OPENING DATE AND TIME. ALL OTHER PS DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED IN RESPONSE TO THIS SOLICITATION, IF ANY, ARE HEREBY REJECTED AS LATE.

RESPONSE -1-	RESPONSE -2-	RESPONSE -3-
Boyle Engineering Corporation 320 E. South Street Orlando, FL 32801 A. Thomas Brown, P.E. (407) 425-1100 – Phone (407) 422-3866 – Fax	CDM 2301 Maitland Center Parkway, Suite 300 Maitland, FL 32751 Brian W. Mack, P.E. (407) 660-2552 – Phone (407) 875-1161 – Fax	Environmental Consulting & Technology, Inc. 809 State Road 44 New Smyrna Beach, FL 32168 Frank E. Marshall, III, Ph.D., P.E. (386) 427-0694 – Phone (386) 427-2075 – Fax
RESPONSE -4-	RESPONSE -5-	
HDR Engineering, Inc. 315 East Robinson St., Ste. 400 Orlando, FL 32801 Steven A. Keyes, P.E. (407) 420-4200 – Phone (407) 420-4242 – Fax	MACTEC Engineering and Consulting, Inc. 4150 N. John Young Pkwy Orlando, FL 32804 Todd D. Schmitt, P.E. (407) 522-7570 – Phone (407) 522-7576 – Fax	

Tabulated by Lisa Riner *(Posted by Lisa Riner April 19, 2007 at 10:00 a.m. Eastern)*

Evaluation Committee Meeting: May 23, 2007 at 10:30 a.m. - Reflections Building, Wekiva Conference Room, 520 W Lake Mary Blvd, Sanford, FL 32773

(Posted by Lisa Riner April 19, 2007 at 10:00 a.m. Eastern)

Evaluation Committee agreed to short-list the following three (3) firms: CDM
Environmental Consulting & Technology, Inc.
MACTEC Engineering and Consulting, Inc.
(Posted by Lisa Riner May 23, 2007 at 1:00 p.m. Eastern)

Presentations: June 28, 2007 at 1:30 p.m. - Reflections Building, Lake Jessup Conference Room, 520 W Lake Mary Blvd, Sanford, FL 32773
(Posted by Lisa Riner May 23, 2007 at 1:00 p.m. Eastern)

CDM	1:30-1:55 p.m.
Environmental Consulting & Technology, Inc.	2:05-2:30 p.m.
MACTEC Engineering and Consulting, Inc.	2:40-3:05 p.m.

Board of County Commissioners Agenda Date - Request Approval to Negotiate (Ranked): July 24, 2007
(Posted by Lisa Riner June 29, 2007 at 9:00 a.m. Eastern)

1. CDM
2. Environmental Consulting & Technology, Inc.
3. MACTEC Engineering and Consulting, Inc.

Board of County Commissioners Agenda Date – Award: TBD

EVALUATION RANKINGS

PS-1905-07/BLH- Engineering Study, Inventory and Design for the Monroe Drainage Basin

	M. Flomerfelt	J. McCollum	K. Ornberg	R. Raymundo	R. Walter	TOTAL POINTS RANKING
Boyle Engineering Corporation	5	5	5	5	5	25
CDM	1	1	2	1	1	6
Environmental Consulting & Technology, Inc.	2	3	1	3	3	12
HDR Engineering, Inc.	4	4	3	4	4	19
MACTEC Engineering and Consulting, Inc.	3	2	4	2	2	13

The Evaluation Committee agrees to short-list the following firms:

CDM
Environmental Consulting & Technology, Inc.
MACTEC Engineering and Consulting, Inc.


Mark Flomerfelt


Jerry McCollum


Kim Ornberg


Rolando Raymundo


Robert Walter

PRESENTATION RANKINGS

PS-1905-07/BLH- Engineering Study, Inventory and Design for the Monroe Drainage Basin


	M. Flomerfelt	J. McCollum	K. Ornberg	R. Raymundo	R. Walter	TOTAL POINTS	RANKING
CDM	1	1	1	1	1	5	1
Environmental Consulting & Technology, Inc.	2	2	2	3	2	11	2
MACTEC Engineering and Consulting, Inc.	3	3	3	2	3	14	3

The Evaluation Committee agrees to the following ranking:

CDM
Environmental Consulting & Technology, Inc.
MACTEC Engineering and Consulting, Inc.


Mark Flomerfelt


Jerry McCollum


Kim Ornberg


Rolando Raymundo


Robert Walter

Presentation

PS-1905-07/BLH-Engineering Study, Inventory and Design for Monroe Drainage Basin

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: CDM

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Kim Ornberg

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

- 90 – 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- 80 – 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- 70 – 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- 60 – 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach / Understanding of the Project (50%)

2001 Monroe Study; 2500 AC land use change; full design capabilities; cost estimating; Lincoln Heights: tailwater too high

TMDL – addressing untreated areas w/direct discharge to
LK Monroe

Score 90
(0-100)

Criteria: Similar Work of Proposed Team (30%)

Conducted original Monroe basin study (2001)
Lockhart Smith; T-4 Barrow Pit, etc (several others)
Elder Creek

Score 95
(0-100)

Criteria: Innovative and cost-saving ideas (20%)

LIDAR; Archydro – ICPR V3 – TMDL wa issues
ranking matrix
Computational Fluid Dynamics for BMP selection

Score 70
(0-100)

TOTAL SCORE (0-100 Points)

87.5

RANKING

1

Presentation

PS-1905-07/BLH-Engineering Study, Inventory and Design for Monroe Drainage Basin

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Environmental Consulting & Technology, Inc.

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Kim Ornberg

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

- | | |
|----------|--|
| 90 – 100 | Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings |
| 80 – 89 | Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects. |
| 70 – 79 | Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is |
| 60 – 69 | Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications |
| Below 60 | Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable |

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach / Understanding of the Project (50%)

3 phases: Ph I Airport Blvd conflicts - shift parcels - refine design
Ph II - update new data - GIS table links; ICPR update;
conceptual
Ph III - prep construction plans

Score 85
(0-100)

Criteria: Similar Work of Proposed Team (30%)

ECT, Rockett + Assoc. (Survey); Norbise (Geotech); ZFI (Eng + Construction)
ArcGIS 9.2 SWEWMD
Retrofit projects - bid retention; pumping systems;
alum
SWMP - New Symrna Beach + LK Helen

Score 85
(0-100)

Criteria: Innovative and cost-saving ideas (20%)

Utilize existing info; Arc Hydro; identify immediate
"low hanging fruit" maintenance, non-structural
easements

Score 85
(0-100)

TOTAL SCORE (0-100 Points)

85

RANKING

2

Presentation

PS-1905-07/BLH-Engineering Study, Inventory and Design for Monroe Drainage Basin

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: MACTEC Engineering and Consulting, Inc.

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Kim Ornberg

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

90 – 100	Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
80 – 89	Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
70 – 79	Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
60 – 69	Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
Below 60	Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach / Understanding of the Project (50%)

Lincoln Heights - high tail water / storage - WQ d
Ravena Park - update size
Ph2 - update for calibration of 2004 hurricane season
Ph3 - WQ + quantity updates/projects

Score 80
(0-100)

Criteria: Similar Work of Proposed Team (30%)

→ Heather Hammer -
Joel Jordan - prev. W/CDM - did original modeline efforts
Wekiva Basin - nitrate sourcing/loading (WQ)
Public Outreach
SW + LK Mgmt Plan - Maitland; Mc Allister
Daytona Beach SWMP + update - innovation of pond

Score 80
(0-100)

Criteria: Innovative and cost-saving ideas (20%)

Heather Hammer - WQ modeling + impacts
Combine features to gain public acceptance
multi-purpose projects - irrigation re-use
Selling fill material - don't reinvent the wheel -
use optimization tools; minimize environmental
impacts

- re use to address TMDL Load reductions

Score 75
(0-100)

TOTAL SCORE (0-100 Points)

79

RANKING

3

Presentation

PS-1905-07/BLH-Engineering Study, Inventory and Design for Monroe Drainage Basin

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: CDM

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Robert Walter

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

- 90 – 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- 80 – 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- 70 – 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- 60 – 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach / Understanding of the Project (50%)

Many of the original 2001 Basin Study will be on CDM's team. Since CDM did the 2001 Study they know the basin and problem areas they know about the recent development in the area and how the 2500 Ac have changed since the

Score 95
(0-100)

Criteria: Similar Work of Proposed Team (30%)

CDM did the original 2001 Study, and Lake-Tomp Study and Crystal Lake Management Study

Score 95
(0-100)

Criteria: Innovative and cost-saving ideas (20%)

Implementing GPS into retrofit projects, CDM keeps digital records of all structures in the area. Suggested to use Fluid Dynamics in the Modeling

Score 90
(0-100)

TOTAL SCORE (0-100 Points)

94

RANKING

1

Presentation

PS-1905-07/BLH-Engineering Study, Inventory and Design for Monroe Drainage Basin

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Environmental Consulting & Technology, Inc.

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Robert Walter

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

- 90 – 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- 80 – 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- 70 – 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- 60 – 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach / Understanding of the Project (50%)

*For service team but not 1 company, understands the master plan process + 3 phases
but didn't fully understand the flows/why the system worked at Friedenthal.
they didn't work on the original survey but did want to conduct w/
County staff and not "reinvent the wheel."*

Score ~~85~~ 85
(0-100)

Criteria: Similar Work of Proposed Team (30%)

*Similar projects using green, bio treatment and other facilities
did Lake Helen, New Smyrna updates to master plans. Most of
these projects were done by the Company but not the PM.*

Score 85
(0-100)

Criteria: Innovative and cost-saving ideas (20%)

*Suggested to incorporate Arc Hydro and GIS into the basin
update and suggest 319 funding for other projects & suggested
we do that here.*

Score 70
(0-100)

TOTAL SCORE (0-100 Points)

82

RANKING

2

Presentation

PS-1905-07/BLH-Engineering Study, Inventory and Design for Monroe Drainage Basin

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: MACTEC Engineering and Consulting, Inc.

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Robert Walter

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

- | | |
|----------|--|
| 90 – 100 | Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings |
| 80 – 89 | Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects. |
| 70 – 79 | Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is |
| 60 – 69 | Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications |
| Below 60 | Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable |

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach / Understanding of the Project (50%)

understand the project, but not in full detail. understood the 3 phases of the contract. Lincoln Heights, basin storm update and construction would develop list of potential projects & prioritize them.

Score ~~90~~ 70
(0-100)

Criteria: Similar Work of Proposed Team (30%)

worked Metrotec source model for Metrotec Basin, MacTland watershed / land use / management plan. McAllister & Dayton Brook Stormwater Master Plan

Score 80
(0-100)

Criteria: Innovative and cost-saving ideas (20%)

suggested MACTEC propose funding and coordination with other County projects. Suggested getting funding from government agencies and ~~not~~ using the existing study so that efforts won't be duplicative

Score 90
(0-100)

TOTAL SCORE (0-100 Points)

77

RANKING

3

Presentation

PS-1905-07/BLH-Engineering Study, Inventory and Design for Monroe Drainage Basin

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: CDM

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Rolando Raymundo

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

- 90 – 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- 80 – 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- 70 – 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- 60 – 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach / Understanding of the Project (50%)

Excellent understanding & approach. Very familiar w/ the basin & its problems.

Score 45
(0-100)

Criteria: Similar Work of Proposed Team (30%)

Members of the proposed team have excellent & good amount of experience

Score 20
(0-100)

Criteria: Innovative and cost-saving ideas (20%)

With a good understanding of the basin they have excellent innovative & cost saving ideas proactive approach w/ the incoming TMDL problem

Score 15
(0-100)

TOTAL SCORE (0-100 Points)

80

RANKING

1

Presentation

PS-1905-07/BLH-Engineering Study, Inventory and Design for Monroe Drainage Basin

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Environmental Consulting & Technology, Inc.

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Rolando Raymundo

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

90 – 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
80 – 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
70 – 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
60 – 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach / Understanding of the Project (50%)

Very good approach & understanding of the project

Score 30
(0-100)

Criteria: Similar Work of Proposed Team (30%)

They have adequate amount of similar project experiences.

Score 15
(0-100)

Criteria: Innovative and cost-saving ideas (20%)

They showed some good innovative approach ideas.

Score 10
(0-100)

TOTAL SCORE (0-100 Points)

55

RANKING

3

Presentation

PS-1905-07/BLH-Engineering Study, Inventory and Design for Monroe Drainage Basin

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: MACTEC Engineering and Consulting, Inc.

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Rolando Raymundo

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

90 – 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
80 – 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
70 – 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
60 – 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach / Understanding of the Project (50%)

Very good understanding & approach of the project

Score 35
(0-100)

Criteria: Similar Work of Proposed Team (30%)

Good excellent amount of similar work of proposed

Score 15
(0-100)

Criteria: Innovative and cost-saving ideas (20%)

They have provided excellent & new ideas innovative & possible cost-saving ideas.

Score 20
(0-100)

TOTAL SCORE (0-100 Points)

70

RANKING

2

Presentation

PS-1905-07/BLH-Engineering Study, Inventory and Design for Monroe Drainage Basin

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: CDM

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Mark Flomerfelt

MC 6/2/07

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

- 90 – 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- 80 – 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- 70 – 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- 60 – 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach / Understanding of the Project (50%)

92

2500ft channels since 1998
-complete electronic deliverables
-CANADIAN TAILWATER 31.4 vs 30.9
-models use version 3
update loads model since channels
LAND AVAILABILITY AND TMLs

Score *92*
(0-100)

Criteria: Similar Work of Proposed Team (30%)

88

Same staff as Monroe in 1998
Full GIS/STRUCTURAL in House + contracted for
7 projects in Basin
ELDER, I-4, ORANGE AVE BRIDGE
CRISTAL CHANNEL

Score *88*
(0-100)

Criteria: Innovative and cost-saving ideas (20%)

89

Latest models Data / Arch. Data
Look at channels FEMA MAP
On CHIN - High ALB
Focus on Direct Discharge Ditches
-COMPUTATIONAL FLUID DYNAMICS

Score *89*
(0-100)

TOTAL SCORE (0-100 Points)

90.2

RANKING

1

Presentation

PS-1905-07/BLH-Engineering Study, Inventory and Design for Monroe Drainage Basin

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Environmental Consulting & Technology, Inc.

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Mark Flomerfelt

MK 6/28/07

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

- 90 - 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- 80 - 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- 70 - 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- 60 - 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach / Understanding of the Project (50%)

82

GOOD UNDERSTANDING OF TRANS SYSTEM
- REPAIR CONCEPTUAL DESIGN
- UPDATE COMPLEX PROCESS AREAS 9.2
- PROVIDE NEW LOOK AT MODEL

Score 82
(0-100)

ZFI, NODARSE

Criteria: Similar Work of Proposed Team (30%)

85

CHAS FAVORABLE - PROSED MON
- DISTRO FC PROSED WATER
- ID SLIPES
- 0.5 LOW MONITOR & WORK FORST

Score 85
(0-100)

Criteria: Innovative and cost-saving ideas (20%)

84

- ARCH PRO WORK USE COST SAVING
- USED EXISTING INFO
- TO MEASURE MAIN NEEDS

Score 84
(0-100)

TOTAL SCORE (0-100 Points)

83.3

RANKING

2

Presentation

PS-1905-07/BLH-Engineering Study, Inventory and Design for Monroe Drainage Basin

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: MACTEC Engineering and Consulting, Inc.

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Mark Flomerfelt

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

- | | |
|----------|--|
| 90 - 100 | Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings |
| 80 - 89 | Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects. |
| 70 - 79 | Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is |
| 60 - 69 | Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications |
| Below 60 | Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable |

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach / Understanding of the Project (50%)

Lincoln Hrs - CONSTRUCT PLANS / PIPES
Riverside Park - SAME TYPE OF PROJECT
Verification of WQ DATA
UPDATE BASIN
Both TMDL IMPROVED LINED
Channel - STABILIZED
Joe Jordan - Prior LDM
Hertel Hammes

Score 78
(0-100)

Criteria: Similar Work of Proposed Team (30%)

N. TRAD SOURCE STUDY WELLS BASIN
CONCEPT MODEL FOR NUTRIENTS
MAINTAIN STORMWATER FLOW
NSB - DRAINAGE
- SHOWED DAYTONA BEACH STORMWATER MASTER
PLAN - Royal CONSULTING

Score 76
(0-100)

Criteria: Innovative and cost-saving ideas (20%)

ALTERNATIVES TO Lc MONROE
FUND-RAISE 200,000 w/ ALUM
- PUBLIC NOTIFICATION / KIOSKS
- PAVE # IMPLEMENTATION
- FUNDING PARTNERS FOR PAVING

Score 72
(0-100)

- RLS worked w/ Mactec Prior?

TOTAL SCORE (0-100 Points)

76.2

RANKING

3

Presentation

PS-1905-07/BLH-Engineering Study, Inventory and Design for Monroe Drainage Basin

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: CDM

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Jerry McCollum

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

- 90 – 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- 80 – 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- 70 – 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- 60 – 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach / Understanding of the Project (50%)

Covered problem/issues in basin: 2500 Acres at
Chuga 2005. Covered overall management process.
QA/QC processes. Detail analysis on Lincoln Heights
(Tailwater issue) - New GIS tools, TMDL issues and
Ranking criteria - Very good discussions on PIP processes
TMDL issue.
(Cover direct discharge areas) Very Good:

Score 80 40.0
(0-100)

Criteria: Similar Work of Proposed Team (30%)

Did original basin study. 180 local staff
Very strong team that has worked
on numerous SW projects including
San. Co. project. Numerous projects in basin
Very good (+) Strong staff

Score 82 24.6
(0-100)

Criteria: Innovative and cost-saving ideas (20%)

Fluid Dynamic Models, etc.
Expertise in basin
Good

Score 75 15.0
(0-100)

TOTAL SCORE (0-100 Points)

79.6

RANKING

1

Presentation

PS-1905-07/BLH-Engineering Study, Inventory and Design for Monroe Drainage Basin

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Environmental Consulting & Technology, Inc.

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Jerry McCollum

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

- 90 – 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- 80 – 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- 70 – 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- 60 – 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach / Understanding of the Project (50%)

Discuss Lincoln Heights issues. Conflicts with Airport Blvd. Need to refine concepts. Phase II Master Plan. Growth in basin. GIS mapping. Little general on Master Plan.

Some Specifics (Good ++)

39.0

Score 78
(0-100)

Criteria: Similar Work of Proposed Team (30%)

Team has worked together on several projects. Have numerous projects. Strong staff work on Jesup for Co.

Very good

24.0

Score 80
(0-100)

Criteria: Innovative and cost-saving ideas (20%)

Identify grants. Maintenance treatments (General)

Good

15.0

Score 75
(0-100)

TOTAL SCORE (0-100 Points)

78

RANKING

2

Presentation

PS-1905-07/BLH-Engineering Study, Inventory and Design for Monroe Drainage Basin

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: MACTEC Engineering and Consulting, Inc.

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Jerry McCollum

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

- 90 – 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- 80 – 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- 70 – 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- 60 – 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach / Understanding of the Project (50%)

Covered in general most key areas.
Little too general. Did not rate sources
for Wickliffe. Good experience in modeling

37.0

Good (-)

Score 74
(0-100)

Criteria: Similar Work of Proposed Team (30%)

Have done numerous projects. More
in existing business, work in other
local government.

23.4

Good (++)

Score 78
(0-100)

Criteria: Innovative and cost-saving ideas (20%)

Water Park, - Grants
Sell fill
M... Env. Impact

15.0

Good

Score 75
(0-100)

TOTAL SCORE (0-100 Points)

75.4

RANKING

3